DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 230 214 JC 830 182

TITLE Status of Open Door Admissions. Issues, Trends and Projects Committee Report No. 1.
INSTITUTION National Council of State Directors of Community-Junior Colleges.
PUB DATE Apr 83
NOTE 35p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Budgeting; *Community Colleges; *Educational Philosophy; *Educational Trends; *Enrollment Influences; National Surveys; *Open Enrollment; Questionnaires; State Legislation; Two Year Colleges

ABSTRACT

In January 1983, a study was conducted to determine the level of commitment of community colleges throughout the United States to the philosophy of open door access to enrollment. A questionnaire was mailed to each state director of community college education to determine whether the state had a formal commitment to an open door admissions policy, whether the commitment was made policy in a written document, and whether the policy had legal status. In addition, the officials were asked to cite widely reported statements on the open door concept within the state; to indicate the budgetary factors impeding open door admissions; and to answer questions regarding the role of enrollment projections in the budgetary process. Study findings, based on responses from 37 states, included the following: (1) 30 states had a formal commitment to the establishment and maintenance of an open door admissions policy to the community colleges, and in 29 states this commitment was contained in a written document; (2) in 10 states legal status was given to this commitment through statute, in 21 states by administrative regulation or policy, in 8 states by precedent and practice, and in 1 state by court ruling; and (3) there appears to be a growing trend to curtail enrollments by means of the budgeting process. The study report provides a state-by-state analysis of survey responses and includes the survey instrument. (HB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED230214

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF STATE DIRECTORS OF COMMUNITY/JUNIOR COLLEGES

STATUS OF OPEN DOOR ADMISSIONS

VC 830 182

Issues, Trends and Projects Committee
Report No. 1
April 1983

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

W. C. Witter

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF STATE DIRECTORS
OF COMMUNITY/JUNIOR COLLEGES

ALABAMA
Howard Gundy
Chancellor
Community Colleges
and Technical Institutes

ALASKA
George P. Melican
Chancellor
Community Colleges,
Rural Education and Extension

ARIZONA
Russell O. Bloyer
Executive Director
State Board of Directors
for Community Colleges of Arizona

ARKANSAS
Tom Spencer
Associate Director, Community Colleges
Department of Higher Education

CALIFORNIA
Gerald C. Hayward
Office of the Chancellor
California Community College System

COLORADO
James F. Weber
Director, Community Colleges
Colorado State Board
of Community Colleges
and Occupational Education

CONNECTICUT
Office of the Executive Director
Regional Community Colleges

CONNECTICUT
Lewis Hyde
Executive Director
Board of Trustees
for State Technical Colleges

DELAWARE
John R. Kotula
President
Delaware Technical
and Community Colleges

FLORIDA
Office of the Director
Division of Community Colleges
State Department of Education

GEORGIA
Haskin R. Pounds
Assistant Vice Chancellor
University System of Georgia

HAWAII
Dewey H. Kim
Chancellor for Community Colleges
University of Hawaii

ILLINOIS
David Pierce
Executive Director
Illinois Community College Board

INDIANA
George B. Weathersby
Commissioner
Commission for Higher Education

IOWA
William M. Baley
Associate State Superintendent
Area Schools
and Career Education Branch
Department of Public Instruction

KANSAS
Sam Newland
Director
Postsecondary Administration
State Department of Education

KENTUCKY
Charles Wethington
Chancellor
Community College System

MARYLAND
Brent M. Johnson
Executive Director
State Board for Community Colleges

MASSACHUSETTS
John B. Duff
Chancellor
Board of Regents
of Higher Education

MICHIGAN
James H. Folkening
Acting Director
Community College Services Unit
Department of Education

MINNESOTA
Philip C. Helland
Chancellor
Community College System

MISSISSIPPI
George V. Moody
Director
Division of Junior Colleges
State Department of Education

MISSOURI
Aphrodite Brough
Associate Director, Academic Affairs
Department of Higher Education

NEW HAMPSHIRE
Charles Green
Chief
Division of Postsecondary Education

NEW JERSEY
Donald H. Smith
Interim Director
Office
of Community College Programs
Department of Higher Education

NEW MEXICO
William C. Witter
Assistant Executive Secretary
Board of Educational Finance

NEW YORK
Cornelius V. Robbins
Associate Chancellor
for Community Colleges
State University of New York

NORTH CAROLINA
Larry Blake
State President
State Department
of Community Colleges

OHIO
William W. Miller
Administrator, Two-Year Campuses
Ohio Board of Regents

NEW HAMPSHIRE
Charles Green
Chief
Division of Postsecondary Education

OKLAHOMA
Joe Leone
Chancellor
State Regents for Higher Education

OREGON
Robert E. Hamill
Associate Superintendent
for Community Colleges

PENNSYLVANIA
Warren D. Evans
State Director, Community Colleges
Division of Postsecondary Education
Department of Education

RHODE ISLAND
Edward J. Liston
President
Community Colleges of Rhode Island

SOUTH CAROLINA
G. William Dudley
Executive Director
State Board for Technical
and Comprehensive Education

TENNESSEE
Bert Bach
Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
State Board of Regents
State University
and Community College System

TEXAS
David T. Kelly
Assistant Commissioner
for Community Colleges
and Continuing Education
Coordinating Board
Texas College and University System

UTAH
Don A. Carpenter
Assistant Commissioner
for Academic Affairs
Utah State Board of Regents

VIRGINIA
James H. Hinson, Jr.
Chancellor
Virginia Community College System

WASHINGTON
John N. Terrey
Executive Director
State Board
for Community College Education

WEST VIRGINIA
M. Douglas Call
Director of Community College
and Vocational Education
West Virginia Board of Regents

WISCONSIN
Robert P. Sorensen
State Director
Board of Vocational-Technical
and Adult Education

WYOMING
Russell A. Hansen
Executive Secretary
Community College Commission

PUERTO RICO
Carlos E. Reoyo
Chancellor of Regional Colleges
University of Puerto Rico

PREFACE

For the past thirty years, America's community colleges have provided an opportunity for millions of Americans to obtain access to higher education. Recently, however, there have been serious questions raised regarding the status of the commitment to access. This study, requested by the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges and the National Council of State Directors of Community/Junior Colleges, is an attempt to determine if the philosophy of access has changed. It is hopeful that this report will be of benefit to those interested in community college education.

Brent M. Johnson
Chairman
Issues, Trends and Projects Committee

CONTENTS

	Page
PREFACE	vii
Question 1	
Does your state have a formal commitment to the establishment and maintenance of an open door admissions policy?	2
Question 2	
Is the commitment made policy in a written document?	2
Question 3	
If there is a legal status to commitment, is it constitutional provision, statutory law, executive order, court ruling, administrative regulation or policy, or precedent and practice?	2
Responses to Questions 1, 2, and 3 by State	3
Question 4	
In many cases, pronouncements by public officials can have as much impact as formal policy. Cite any recent examples of widely reported statements on the open door concept in your state.	4
Question 5	
The budgetary process differs markedly state-by-state. Indicate the budgetary factors that impede the open door concept in your state.	8
Question 6	
Does your budgetary process require projection of enrollment substantially in advance of class registration? Has the projection been used as a means of limiting financial exposure? Have enrollments in excess of projection been funded through deficiency or supplemental appropriations?	15
Question 7	
Discuss any other aspect of your state's enrollment policy not yet addressed in these questions which you feel is important.	21
APPENDICES	
A. Respondents	25
B. Survey Form	27

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF STATE DIRECTORS
OF COMMUNITY/JUNIOR COLLEGES

STATUS OF OPEN DOOR ADMISSIONS

In January 1983, a survey, contained as Appendix B in this document, was mailed to each State Director of Community Colleges. The survey was an attempt to determine the status of open door access to community college enrollment. What follows is a summary of that survey which was responded to by 37 states.

While no interpretative analysis has been made regarding the responses to the survey, it is apparent that there is a significant commitment on the part of the respondents to an open door admissions policy. Twenty-nine states, or 78 percent of the total respondents, have a commitment to access contained in a policy document. The majority are contained in administrative regulations or policies. There appears to be, however, a growing trend to curtail enrollments by means of the budgeting process. Some states make no attempt to disguise this approach and, in fact, specify absolute total numbers of students who can be admitted. Other states simply indicate how many students they will pay for and allow the institutions the freedom of admitting additional studerts.

It is incumbent upon trustee associations and presidents' councils, as well as state boards for community colleges, to carefully examine their state's commitment to access. In those states where this commitment appears to be waning, positive public steps should be taken to revitalize educational opportunities.

Summary Totals of Questions 1, 2, and 3.

1. *Does your state have a formal commitment to the establishment and maintenance of an open door admissions policy to the community colleges?*

   30 states (81 percent) answered "yes"; seven (19 percent) answered "no".

2. *Is the commitment made policy in a written document?*

   29 states (78 percent) answered "yes"; eight states (22 percent) answered "no".

3. *If there is a legal status to commitment, is it:*

   Constitutional provision:

   100 percent answered "no"

   Statutory law:

   27 percent (10) answered "yes"; 73 percent (27) answered "no"

   Executive order:

   100 percent answered "no"

   Court ruling:

   3 percent (1) answered "yes"; 97 percent (36) answered "no"

   Administrative regulation or policy:

   57 percent (21) answered "yes"; 43 percent (16) answered "no"

   Precedent and practice:

   22 percent (8) answered "yes"; 78 percent (29) answered "no"

RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS 1, 2, AND 3 BY STATE

Question	AL	AK	AZ	AR	CA	CO	CT	DE	FL	GA	HI	IL	IA	KY	MD	MA	MI	MN	MS
1. Does your state have a formal commit ment to the establishment and maintenance of an open door admissions policy to the community colleges?	yes	no	no	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	no	yes	no	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	no	yes
2. Is the commitment made policy in a written document?	yes	no	no	no	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	no	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	no	no
3. If there is a legal status to commitment, is it:																			
Constitutional provision	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no
Statutory law	no	no	no	no	yes	yes	no	no	no	no	yes	yes	no	no	yes	no	no	no	no
Executive Order	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no
Court ruling	yes	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no
Administrative regulation or policy	yes	no	no	no	yes	no	yes	yes	yes	no	no	no	yes	yes	no	yes	yes	no	no
Precedent and practice	yes	no	yes	yes	no	no	yes	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	yes

Question	NJ	NM	NY	NC	OH	OK	OR	PA	RI	SC	TN	TX	UT	VA	WA	WV	WI	WY
1. Does your state have a formal commitment to the establishment and maintenance of an open door admissions policy to the community colleges?	yes	no	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	no
2. Is the commitment made policy in a written document?	yes	no	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	no
3. If there is a legal status to commitment, is it:																		
Constitutional provision	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no
Statutory law	no	no	no	no	yes	no	no	yes	no	yes	no	yes	no	no	yes	no	no	no
Executive Order	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no
Court ruling	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no
Administrative regulation or policy	yes	no	yes	yes	no	yes	yes	yes	yes	no	no	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	no	no
Precedent and practice	yes	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	yes	no	no	no	no	yes	no

The following responses to questions 4 thru 6 were provided. Not all states answered all questions.

4. *In many cases, pronouncements by public officials can have as much impact as formal policy. Cite any recent examples of widely reported statements (pro or con) on the open door concept in your state recently.*

Alabama

Because of the vision of a Governor and the Alabama Legislature, the State of Alabama is enriched by the distribution of two-year colleges which are located within 35 miles of 90 percent of all citizens. All colleges maintain an unwavering commitment to open admissions with programs designed to serve a wide range of abilities and interests. The principal challenge to access lies in the relative inadequacy of funds.

California

1976 Statement of Philosophy and Goals.

1982 Mission and Priority Statement (being considered by the Board of Governors).

Connecticut

In 1982, the Governor's Commission on Higher Education and the Economy issued a report and recommendations on the structure and operations of the state's higher education system.

With respect to issues of academic quality and access, the Commission report stated, in part, "Institutions do need to retain flexibility in admissions to reach out to students of high potential and most achievement, as well as to the disadvantaged and adult learners who have been out of the mainstream of education for a number of years. Consequently, the academic profile developed for each incoming class should be constructed in such a way as to enroll some students whose academic records might place them below the admissions 'floor' for the institution. The community colleges would continue as open-access institutions."

Delaware

Delaware Technical and Community College is a multi-campus institution serving the entire State of Delaware. The open door policy is designed to provide easy access for students to the Institution but is not designed for open access to all curricula. Students must meet specific requirements to be admitted to curricula within the College. Developmental and pre-technical instruction is provided for students to assist them in qualifying for admission to the curricula.

Florida

The Master Plan for the Florida Community College System, November 1982, states:

The system will "provide quality education to all students and equal opportunity to all college employees . . . maintain a strong documented and continuing commitment to make a quality education available to all Florida adult citizens regardless of age, sex or race; regardless of economic, cultural, or physical condition; regardless of previous educational attainment or geographic location; provided they have the potential to benefit from such education."

Illinois

Most community colleges practice the open door admission policy to the college as a commitment that the college makes to its community. Most community colleges do not allow open door admission to all their programs, however.

Maryland

In Maryland, the Governor and General Assembly have committed themselves to open access to community colleges. Community colleges have been highlighted as a deliverer of training and retraining opportunities for the unemployed.

Massachusetts

Recent public discussions and hearings have been held on minimum admissions standards for the Massachusetts public colleges and universities which include open admission to the fifteen public community colleges.

Mississippi

The State Senate Ad Hoc Committees on Education Report of September 1982 recommends specified high school subjects prerequisite to admission to junior college or senior college (public).

Junior college response to above confirming support of open door concept and mission of the public two-year institutions states "the committee believes that the school system in this state has strayed from requiring that students be taught certain fundamentals of knowledge which provide the necessary foundation to enable a graduate to competently enter postsecondary curricula, whether his choice be college, junior college or vocational-technical training. The committee applauds the recent action of the Board of Trustees of Institutions of Higher Learning in identifying what a college preparatory program is. The committee recommends legislation which enforces this action by the college board by requiring as a prerequisite to admission three years of mathematics, four years of English, three years of natural science and two and one-half years of social science. Additionally, the legislation proposed by the committee expands the college board requirements by including the successful completion of two years of foreign language study and by applying these standards to entering junior college students, all to be phased-in over a three-year period."

New Jersey

The Administrative Code states the purposes and objectives of the board of trustees of each community college is "to make education accessible to all high school graduates, those holding a GED certificate, or other persons 18 years of age and older in their service boundary areas, within the limits of available resources."

Ohio

"Report: Advisory Commission on Articulation between Secondary Education and Ohio Colleges", page 2.

"Master Plan for Higher Education", September 1982, pages 15-20.

Pennsylvania

There have been no pronouncements by public officials on the open door concept at Pennsylvania's fourteen community colleges. Statute and State board of education regulations from its inception have a stated open door concept.

The Master Plan for Higher Education in Pennsylvania, 1978, also refers to it.

Texas

The open door concept is generally recognized and referred to in public statements by education officials and informed legislators on appropriate occasions, but no particularly noteworthy pronouncements are known. However, in the last two or three years a few university educators and others have publically stated that compensatory work in college is inappropriate, is not collegiate, and should not be state supported. While this position might call the open door into question, there is no consolidated movement or effort to abandon the practice.

Virginia

Statement of higher education priorities by the General Professional Advisory Committee of the State Council of Higher Education for the Governor's 1984-86 Guidance Package:

> "A well-educated and highly-trained workforce is essential to the development and maintenance of Virginia's industrial strength. Therefore, a priority of Virginia's system of state-supported colleges and universities is to guarantee access to higher education to all who want and can benefit from it."

Issue: Concern exists among some legislators and government officials regarding the number of unclassified students (45 percent of the total headcount enrollment for Fall 1982) in the VCCS, i.e., those not enrolled in a specific curriculum but enrolled in one of the ten non-curricular categories shown on the information from Section 6 of the VCCS Policy Manual.

Washington

Accessibility (not necessarily the open door policy, per se) has been stressed in recent major addresses by the Governor. It has also been a key issue in the development of a new six-year plan for higher education adopted by the Council for Postsecondary Education.

Wyoming

The recruitment and public relations information published by the colleges in Wyoming and by the Wyoming Community College Commission are very pro-access in their approach.

5. *The budgetary process differs markedly state-by-state. This is especially true for community colleges which may be funded programmatically, line-item, or by formula. Please indicate the budgetary factors that impede the open door concept in your state. Please note your professional judgement as to whether such factors realistically leave limited access.*

Alabama

Alabama's two-year colleges are funded by formula. Free tuition, fees, and books are provided for prisoner students.

An impedance is that double tuition is charged for students who are not residents of Alabama.

Also, the transportation system is becoming too expensive to endure. A few colleges have completely dropped it, and a few now charge a small fee to ride the postsecondary school buses.

Free school bus transportation has traditionally been a unique component of our commitment to our largely rural and somewhat disadvantaged clientele.

Because of the increasing costs and increasing sophistication of knowledge and aptitude requirements in some technical, many of the programs within our institutions have established entrance requirements which limit access but which enhance program success rates thereby creating a better return on investment of state tax revenues.

Alaska

The open door concept is impeded by line item budgetary process. This restricts the services afforded to students especially since community college priorities must compete with four-year units in the state.

Arizona

The declining level of state support (23 percent of operating costs) and the limit on taxation at the local level will cause tuition to be increased. This will cause admissions problems.

Arkansas

In recent years the state's financial resources have not permitted funding which keeps up with inflation and increased enrollment. Even the amounts appropriated have not been funded. This shortage of funds has limited access in cases where additional sections of courses could not be offered. While this has occurred to limited extents through 1982-83, it will be more common as increases below inflation and increased enrollment continue.

California

Access has been a major concern of the Legislature, the Board of Governors, and community college educators. The commitment to the open door concept is exemplified by California's no-tuition policy. With recent fiscal constraints; however, there is pressure to refine the open door concept to ask who should have open admission and whose responsibility is it to pay for education.

The California Community Colleges are funded by formula. Recent limitations on workload growth by the Legislature may have impeded the open door concept, particularly at colleges where there is population growth causing the demand for educational services to exceed available funding.

Colorado

The current problem involves state revenue shortfalls which have resulted in appropriations cutbacks. The immediate access impacts are (1) cancellation of many classes with marginal enrollments, and (2) consideration of elimination of some high-cost programs.

Connecticut

Since the mid-1970s, higher education budgets in Connecticut have been essentially 'historical' budgets. The current level of services is projected into the next fiscal year, and as much as possible of that level is funded within the context of tight fiscal restraints. In recent years, with funding limitations, the dollars have increased, but the effective level of services has decreased. There have seldom been any significant add-ons to the current level in any fiscal year, and when they have occurred, they have been off-set by reductions elsewhere.

The main impediment to the open door in Connecticut is the level of funding which negatively affects the number of people who can be served as well as the quality of the services they receive. Having provided an opportunity through the open door for many to try post-secondary education, we have not necessarily provided the opportunity to succeed, because of our inability to provide all of the support services which are required.

Delaware

The college is funded primarily on a program basis by the General Assembly which may enact a budget which is limited to 98 percent of estimated revenue. Programs, accordingly, are expanded or contracted based on the appropriation received from the General Assembly. Enrollment is limited in some programs for various reasons: lack of space and fund limitations, for example.

Georgia

None other than fact that students must pay tuition and fees which is as it should be.

Hawaii

The Governor can and has placed a budget ceiling for higher education in the state. Hawaii is completely state funded. Also, the Governor can and has reduced the current allocation to higher education in the state because of the reduction in state revenues. In addition, the state Constitution prohibits deficit state financing.

Illinois

To this date, funding of community colleges has been adequate for all colleges to practice the open door concept of admission to the college but not necessarily to all programs.

Iowa

Funding constraints make it difficult to provide as much open door access as desired. For example, the area colleges are limited to a tax of 20¼ cents per thousand dollars of assessed value for operating purposes and state general aid has normally been less than the amount requested. The result is that area colleges cannot provide all of the programs that appear desirable. However, this limitation on fiscal resources is not necessarily new and something that most college administrators would expect to encounter since it is impossible to provide all of the resources that each college would like to receive.

Maryland

In Maryland there is an annual enrollment projection process which is ultimately contained in the state budget. Since this process was initiated in 1975, there has been no attempt on the part of state government to limit enrollments. There is a statutory provision for supplementary appropriations and requests are typically funded. Community colleges may enroll students above their state projection if enrollments exceed approved budgeted numbers.

Massachusetts

The budget process includes all three elements mentioned. It is initially developed upon a formula for each line item, then new programs or needs are an add-on. The primary limiting factor to admission in a few of the community colleges is physical facilities. Certain colleges and certain programs may in fact be limited by budgetary considerations but this varies from year-year-and in different colleges and programs.

Michigan

Michigan distributes state funds on a formula basis. Credit enrollment and equalizers for tuition and local property tax support are primary components. Special services, support services for special population, etc. do not receive special support. Local boards must then wish to provide these services independent of state initiative. The only tuition funds supported through the state for community college students are for competitive scholarship grants and direct student loans. The state does not impede open door; it does not offer incentives for special populations needing special services.

Minnesota

Community colleges in Minnesota are state institutions. Approximately 30 percent of their revenue comes from charges to students, with 70 percent coming from state appropriations.

As expenditures have risen, tuition has risen. Even though financial aid is more available, I suspect that the cost of attending is keeping many persons from enrolling.

Mississippi

No state support for noncredit courses/activities.

Remedial/developmental courses are supported at same level as credit courses.

Part-time and evening coursework are supported at much lower level than full-time day (about 20 percent).

State support is not enrollment driven.

Limited access to specific courses of study due to space and funding.

Budgetary process influences some colleges to limit access; to most, the influence is slight.

New Jersey

New Jersey funds by formula. The major limitation to open access is funding limitations, particularly in the high-cost high-technology and allied health programs where limited program enrollments and offerings exist.

New Mexico

New Mexico's funding formula does not impede the open door. However, tuition is a barrier to some. Present tuition rate is $13 per hour or $156 per semester.

New York

No specific attack on the open door concept. However, with state aid lagging behind inflationary increases, all campuses are faced with the possibility of restricting enrollments in order to meet their budget. The catch, of course, is that this would decrease student revenues and thus add to the income deficiency.

North Carolina

The formula for funding the community college system is FTE student enrollment driven. This formula, provided it is fully funded, enhances the open door concept. In 1982-83, an across-the-board budget cut of 6 percent has had the effect of limiting some enrollment; thus, the door has been closed to some extent.

Ohio

Student fees are high in this state. The state student financial aid program (Ohio Instructional Grants) is intended to offset the limitations high fees impose on access, but eligibility is limited to full-time enrollment and needs tests are rigorous. These two effectively eliminate the working poor and seriously impede the access of the adult student.

Oregon

The share of state support has dropped from 48.7 percent in 1971-72 to an estimated 33.1 percent in the current year. Just the opposite happened to property taxes. We have managed to maintain tuition (which is set by each college board) at the 19-22 percent range.

Pennyslvania

Pennsylvania community colleges are funded by a formula established by statute which mandates one-third of the annual operating cost from the state, one-third from the local sponsors, and the final one-third in the form of student tuition.

There has been no significant budgetary factors that have impeded the open door concept in Pennsylvania.

Rhode Island

None

South Carolina

The general fiscal situation in the state may adversely affect access. Our share of state appropriations has remained constant, but revenues in general are shrinking. The legislature is now considering several tax issues to deal with anticipated deficits.

Tennessee

The Tennessee Higher Education Commission, the agency which coordinates the appropriation request process in Tennessee, has established a policy of not recognizing enrollment growth in the funding formula of our state. Thus, the community colleges must either limit enrollment growth, impeding the open door concept, or provide instruction through funds avaialble.

Texas

Texas community colleges are financed by formula which includes funding for compensatory instruction. In my judgment, the open door concept is not impeded by formula or other budgetary factors.

Utah

Programmatic funding in conjunction with funding of nine system institutions, of which five are two-year colleges. Often when enrollments increase (as is the case in Utah), funding does not automatically follow. There is usually a catch-up factor. There are mounting pressures to curtail or "manage" enrollment if funding is not provided for new growth.

Thus, access is threatened in statements of some of the Regents and system administrators. Some four-year institutions have restricted enrollment, but two-year colleges are only considering their options at this time.

Virginia

The primary budgetary impact on open access has resulted from declining real dollar appropriations relative to rising costs of education. The result has been dramatic increases in tuition and fewer program, course and course section offerings which may have the effect of limiting overall access. The student share (tuition) of the cost of their education has increased from 20 percent in 1981-82 to 22.5 percent in 1982-83 to 25 percent anticipated for 1983-84. The tuition increased in dollars from $128 per quarter in 1981-82 to $186 in 1982-83 for a full-time student per quarter, which is a 45 percent increase. This potential financial impact on access is being examined by the VCCS.

Washington

Washington's budget for higher education is developed through a set of formulas for instruction, student services, libraries, administration, plant maintenance, etc.

The trend in recent legislatures has been to fund higher education at lower percentages of formula. What was once funded at 72 percent of formula may now be funded at 60 percent, for example. This has had an adverse effect on access, to the extent that it has become necessary to hold the line on formula support to maintain quality. The only way to do so is to restrict access.

The greatest detriment to access in state's budgetary process has been in the area of enrollment.

West Virginia

Community colleges are funded on the same formula as four-year colleges.

Vocational education is not a separate line item.

These factors do not necessarily impede the open door concept but do limit somewhat the attention which needs to be given to associate degree programs.

Wisconsin

Vocational-technical schools are limited to not exceed 109.5 percent of the previous year's allowable costs; costs in excess of the 109.5 percent increase do not receive state aid. They are also limited to not exceed a 1.5 mill property tax rate for operational purposes. Vocational-technical students must also pay for tuition that equals 10.5 percent of operational costs in 1983-84 (this will be $15.30 per credit) plus pay fees for consumable supplies and purchase needed tools, uniforms, etc. In times of unemployment and shrinking student aids, those most in need of vocational training may be preempted from participating because of limited funds. Another problem is that unemployment benefits are not paid to full-time students.

Wyoming

No budgetary factors in Wyoming impede access. Schools are extremely well funded and allow programs to expand. Telecommunications advances will increase access.

6. *Does your budgetary process require projection of enrollment substantially in advance of class registration? Has the projection been used as a means of limiting financial exposure? Have enrollments in excess of projection been funded through deficiency or supplemental appropriations?*

Alabama

The formula for funding two-year colleges employs data from the preceding year; enrollment projections are not a factor.

Such a reimbursement formula leaves any college insufficiently funded for a program (or an area) where rapid growth occurs--but only for one year.

Alaska

Enrollment projections are made too far in advance, thus greatly affecting funds. The only additional funding is that generated by the additional student fees from the student enrollments above those which were predicted.

Arizona

Budgetary process requires projection of enrollment in advance of class registration.

The projection has been used as a means of limiting financial exposure.

Enrollments in excess of projection have been funded through deficiency or supplemental appropriations but most difficult to expect presently.

Arkansas

The budgetary process requires projection of enrollment in advance of class registration. The projection has not been used as a means of limiting financial exposure. In recent years, enrollments in excess of projection have not been funded through deficiency or supplemental appropriations.

California

The budgetary process for California community colleges requires that the colleges project enrollments ahead of budget determinations at the state level. Actual reimbursement to the colleges is based on enrollments as they correspond to the allocations derived from the state budget.

Projections have been used as a means of limiting financial exposure.

Enrollments in excess of projection have not been funded. Some districts in California have made up deficits through reserve funds.

Colorado

At present, it is expected that excess enrollments will be funded through supplemental appropriations.

Connecticut

Enrollment is projected, but the General Assembly determines what it proposes to fund, and that has been the current level of enrollment for the past several years.

If colleges admit students beyond the level projected, that is their responsibility. However, their capacity to go beyond that level is only marginal because they are limited by their appropriation in what they can offer.

Delaware

Enrollment estimates are a part of the budget process. However, once the state budget has been approved, it is a requirement to live within it. Requests for supplemental appropriations are not acceptable.

Florida

State funding is based upon projected enrollments as determined by the Legislature. Excessive enrollments are not funded through supplemental appropriations.

Georgia

Budgetary process does not require projection of enrollment in advance of class registration.

The projection is not a means of limiting financial exposure.

Enrollments in excess of projection are not funded through deficiency or supplemental appropriations. Allocation is not based on enrollment.

Hawaii

Hawaii is on a biennium state budget cycle and enrollment projections are made for one and two years in advance. Therefore, the enrollment projections have always been on the increase. For the second year of the biennium budget appropriation, state agencies, such as the higher education department, may go to the Legislature for supplemental appropriations.

Illinois

Budgetary process does not require projection of enrollment in advance of class registration.

Iowa

Enrollment projections are not consistently used as a basis for fiscal requests. In recent years, enrollments in excess of projections have not been funded through deficiency or supplemental appropriations. In recent years, appropriations have generally been line item appropriations to area colleges based on prior year enrollments and expenditures.

Maryland

The budgetary process requires projections of enrollment approximately one year in advance of class registration. The projections have not been used as a means of limiting enrollments. When funds are available, enrollments have been funded through supplemental appropriations.

Massachusetts

The budgetary process is based upon enrollment projections. These projections have had a minimal effect on limiting financial exposure. Enrollments in excess of projection have not been funded through deficiency appropriations; the marginal costs have been insignificant.

Michigan

Budgetary process does not require projection of enrollment in advance of class registration. In years prior to 1976, state funded education existed. The last three years, just to balance the state budget.

Minnesota

Since 1977, enrollment base has remained constant and increased enrollment was supported entirely by the increased tuition revenue. FTE enrollment has increased about 25 percent during that period. The Legislature is now considering average cost funding with the appropriation based upon the enrollment two years earlier.

Mississippi

Projection of enrollment is required; however, this projection is not used as a means of limiting financial support.

Enrollments in excess of projections are not funded through deficit or supplemental appropriations. Excess enrollments simply reduce the dollar amount per student for support.

New Jersey

Although colleges are requested to project enrollments for the budget year, appropriation requests are based upon the level of educational and general expenditures in the fiscal year two years prior to the current budget year.

New Mexico

No potential students are denied access because of funding process.

New York

State aid is based on actual enrollments of the preceding three years; at the time the budget is constructed the actual FTEs may not be certain but any deficiency is made up in a supplemental request.

North Carolina

Projection of enrollment is in advance of class registration. Enrollments in excess of projection are generally funded through deficiency appropriations; however, colleges which experience large enrollment growth are aided to some extent by a reserve fund administered by the State Board of Community Colleges.

Ohio

The budgetary process does require projection of enrollments substantially in advance of class registration. These projections have been used by the legislative budget office to trim higher educational apropriations. Almost invariably, the higher enrollments projected by the Regents materialize. They are not funded by supplemental appropriations. This results in high fees, with concomitant limitations in access.

Oklahoma

Projections of enrollment in advance of class registration is not required. However, this does not limit the number of students in a given program.

Enrollments in excess of projections will be used in projecting the next year's projected enrollment figures.

Oregon

The State Department of Education does projections in order to develop the biennial budget request. Projections have seldom been questioned. On the other hand, the Legislature in the past few years has consistently under-funded the projections. There have been no additional funds provided for the "under-enrollment."

Pennsylvania

The approval of Pennsylvania's state budget prior to the beginning of the fiscal year in July requires the community college to provide enrollment projection data for the coming school year. The projection on community college enrollments has had no limiting financial consequence on the state's community colleges.

Also, enrollments in excess of what has been projected in prior years have been funded through supplemental appropriations.

Rhode Island

Enrollment projections for budgetary purposes are only generated for a year in advance of allocation. Since enrollments have continued thus far to increase (though at a decreasing rate), the budget has not been decreased. Enrollments in excess of projections are not funded with additional resources.

South Carolina

The budgetary process requires projection of enrollment substantially in advance of class registration. The projection has not been used as a means of limiting financial exposure. Enrollments in excess of projection have not been funded.

Tennessee

Enrollment data used in the appropriation process lags one year; for example, the Fall 1982 enrollment data are the basis for the enrollment projections of the 1983-84 fiscal year appropriation. Enrollment ranges and midpoints have been established; enrollment above the midpoint is not funded, but enrollment below the bottom of the range results in a reduction of the enrollment base. No supplemental enrollments have taken place, although special requests have been made and accepted to recognize exceptional growth resulting from program transfers between institutions.

Texas

The Texas formula funding is based upon actual past "base-period" enrollments without contingency funds for growth. However, funding has generally been adequate for the institutions to absorb the modest enrollment increases that have occurred. Official enrollment curtailments have not been imposed by budgetary means. The Legislature provided contingency funds for growth during the late 1960s and early 1970s but that was discontinued as enrollments began to stabilize.

Utah

The budgetary process requires projection of enrollment in advance of class registration.

Supplemental appropriations, but if not forthcoming, excess enrollments have been accommodated through new continuing education sections with overload instruction. But quality of offerings becomes an issue, and this is being carefully monitored.

Virginia

Enrollments are projected on a biennial basis approximately two years in advance of actual student enrollment and are updated annually. Enrollment projections drive the budgetary process that produces appropriations for each institution. State budget policy limits supplemental appropriations to enrollment exceeding approved projections by one percent or less. Enrollments over one percent of projection are absorbed within funding provided on the basis of the approved projections.

Washington

Enrollment projections are established through a negotiation process in which demand and the availability of resources are the primary factors. The biennial projection must be submitted approximately one year ahead of registration for the first Fall quarter of the next biennium, two years ahead of the second Fall quarter. The biennial enrollment projection is treated as a "contracted enrollment" by the Legislature. Since 1981, actual enrollment has been held to the budgeted level. Hence, the enrollment projection is a powerful limitation on enrollment. This policy and subsequent reductions in the state budget, occurring in tandem with substantial tuition increases, have brought about major reductions in community college enrollment.

West Virginia

The budgetary process requires projection of enrollment in advance of class registration.

The projection has not been used as a means of limiting financial exposure.

Enrollments in excess of projection have not been funded.

Wisconsin

In some cases the budgetary process requires projection of enrollment in advance of class registration. Cutbacks in new programs and redesign of existing programs using existing resources has helped fund the enrollments. There are no deficiency or supplemental appropriations.

Wyoming

The budgetary process does not require projection of enrollment in advance of class registration.

The projection has not been used as a means of limiting financial exposure.

Enrollments in excess of projection have been funded. Supplemental appropriations address growth.

7. *Discuss any other aspect of your state's enrollment policy not yet addressed in these questions which you feel is important.*

Alabama

Alabama's two-year college system was designed from the beginning for maximum participation. This includes (1) the even distribution of colleges over the state's area; (2) the statewide free (or nearly free) transportaton system; (3) the low tuition and fees; and (4) the open door admission policies.

Arkansas

The general funding limitations also cause more expensive or less visible activities to be reviewed closely, including occupational programs, developmental activities, counseling, etc.

California

Enrollment in California community colleges has been open to any person over the age of 18 who would benefit from instruction. A number of current issues in California community colleges may have an impact on current practices related to the open door. Policies related to student assessment, matriculation and remediation are under review and may have an impact on access.

Colorado

The State Board for Community Colleges and Occupational Education has approved a concept paper which would encourage area vocational schools with postsecondary programs to enter into cooperative arrangements with existing community colleges, to provide access to community college services in underserved areas of the state. Such a program is now being developed to serve nursing education needs in Southern Colorado.

Delaware

The curricula at the college are closely related to the needs of Delaware business and industry. As a result, employment opportunities are plentiful for the graduates. At the present time, there is a problem providing access for students in many associate degree programs. As such, the need arose to develop waiting lists for admission into technical programs. This is true in continuing education as well as day programs.

Georgia

Students to all colleges (universities, senior colleges, junior colleges) must meet minimum admission requirements (high school graduation, minimum SAT scores) with institutions free to set higher standards. Students pay tuition that varies by level of institution.

Hawaii

While Hawaii community colleges have been able to accommodate enrollment increases through budget increases, the biennium budget for academic year 1983-84 and 1984-85 may, for the first time, force the community colleges to place a cap on enrollment. Whether the Legislature will apropriate additional funds over the Governor's recommended budget for higher education will not be known until the end of the current legislative session. If additional funds are not appropriated, then the enrollment cap will become a reality in 1983-85.

Iowa

Enrollments in recent years have increased partially because of economic conditions. Unfortunately, appropriation increases have been rather modest and have created some problems in maintaining existing programs.

Michigan

The Michigan Community Colleges Activities Classification Statute, July 1981, pages 1-4 and 1-42, gives details of the 32 instructional categories and the reporting definitions.

Mississippi

Admission policy is established by local boards of trustees. Some are considering restrictions, such as minimum ACT scores, specified high school subjects, and GPA.

New Jersey

The main effect on enrollment is the ability to finance programs. Colleges are expected to make every effort to maintain the open door, particularly in the area of remediation.

New York

The three-year weighted average for state funding has been a positive factor (1) for the state having a "firm" number on which to budget state aid, and (2) for the college for the same reasons--if on a downswing in enrollment the weighted average provides a "cushion" and if on an "upswing" they have time to plan expenditures over the long term.

Oregon

Considerable discussion and debate is centered around the effects of dramatically increased tuition in the four-year state schools on the enrollments in the community colleges. The popular wisdom is that a lot of students have run to the community colleges. The fact of the matter is that this cannot be proved or disproved from enrollment data.

South Carolina

Under the open door policy, the colleges may set appropriate standards for student placement in specific programs, but they must also provide developmental studies for students who do not meet program entrance requirements. No ratios or formulae mandate the college's internal distribution of resources but decisions will have to be made in light of quality/quantity issues (high technology competencies vs. literacy, etc.). Influenced by mandated annual program evaluation, colleges may phase-out programs which overlap with programs offered at the public secondary vocational schools.

Texas

So far, the open door is faring well in Texas community colleges and no drastic change in the near future is foreseen.

Virginia

The role of the VCCS in developmental/remedial education may change in the future. If this programmatic area receives less emphasis, corresponding impacts may occur in terms of opportunities for access to higher education unless satisfactory alternatives are developed to adequately serve needs that have been met through this aspect of the community college's comprehensive mission. The VCCS is also committed to increased minority student enrollments through 1985 under the 1983 Amendments to the Virginia Plan for Equal Opportunity in State-Supported Institutions of Higher Education.

Washington

Several other legislatively-mandated policies have had negative impact on enrollment:

(a) Establishment of a two-credit minimum charge such that students who enroll in courses for less than two credits must pay for two.

(b) Establishment of an excess credit charge such that students enrolled for more than 18 credits must pay an additional charge for each credit over 18.

(c) Removal of a blanket award of resident status (for fee paying purposes) for military personnel and their dependents.

(d) The recoding of the many courses of an avocational nature into the non-state funded category.

The 1983 Legislature is considering removing some of these restrictions. The Governor's 1983-85 budget request would provide funding for a partial restoration of enrollments reduced during the past two years.

West Virginia

The Board of Regents has tried without success to get the Legislature to fund basic skills programs. There is concern that without such funding the open door policy will become a revolving door policy.

RESPONDENTS

The following states responded to the Open Door Admissions Concept survey:

Alabama (AL)
Alaska (AK)
Arizona (AZ)
Arkansas (AR)
California (CA)
Colorado (CO)
Connecticut (CT)
Delaware (DE)
Florida (FL)
Georgia (GA)
Hawaii (HI)
Illinois (IL)
Iowa (IA)
Kentucky (KY)
Maryland (MD)
Massachusetts (MA)
Michigan (MI)
Minnesota (MN)
Mississippi (MS)
New Jersey (NJ)
New Mexico (NM)
New York (NY)
North Carolina (NC)
North Dakota (ND)
Ohio (OH)
Oklahoma (OK)
Oregon (OR)
Pennsylvania (PA)
Rhode Island (RI)
South Carolina (SC)
Tennessee (TN)
Texas (TX)
Utah (UT)
Virginia (VA)
Washington (WA)
West Virginia (WV)
Wisconsin (WI)
Wyoming (WY)

SURVEY OF STATE DIRECTORS

OPEN DOOR CONCEPT

JANUARY 1983

_____

(State)

BACKGROUND

The philosophy of open door access to community college enrollment has been historically strong. Nonetheless, there is uncertainty in some states as to the specific legal status of the concept--whether the open door is constitutionally mandated, is imposed by statute, supported by court rulings, executive order, state policy, or merely a condition of precedent and practice. Whatever the legal status of the concept, there is also concern that the open door in practice is being eroded increasingly by state fiscal policy, budgetary caps on enrollment, tax limitation initiatives, or other components of the state and/or local appropriation process. The purpose of this survey is to determine the status of the open door principle in 1983 conceptually and realistically.

1. *Does your state have a formal commitment to the establishment and maintenance of an open door admission policy to the community college?*

   ___ *Yes* ___ *No*

2. *Is the commitment made policy in a written document?*

   ___ *Yes* ___ *No*

3. *Is there a legal status to commitment? If so, is it:*

___ *Constitutional Provision*

__ *Statutory Law*

___ *Executive Order*

___ *Court Ruling*

___ *Administrative regulation or policy of* _____
(Agency)

_____

___ *Precedent and Practice*

Please forward a copy of any written commitment.

These provisions in the same approximate form date from

_____.

4. *In many cases, pronouncements by public officials can have as much impact as formal policy. Cite any recent examples of widely reported statements (pro or con) on the open door concept in your state recently.*

5. *The budgetary process differs markedly state by state. This is especially true for community colleges, which may be funded programmatically, line-item, or by formula. Please indicate the budgetary factors that impede the open door concept in your state. Please note your professional judgment as to whether such factors realistically leave limited access.*

6. *Does your budgetary process require projection of enrollment substantially in advance of class registration? Has the projection been used as a means of limiting financial exposure? Have enrollments in excess of projection been funded through deficiency or supplemental appropriations?*

7. *Discuss any other aspect of your state's enrollment policy not yet addressed in these questions which you feel is important.*

(Date) _____ (Submitted by) _____

(Telephone Number) _____ (Title) _____

(Address) _____

_____

_____

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges
8118 Math-Sciences Building
University of California
Los Angeles, California 90024
JUL 15 1983